

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 are the claims currently pending in the Application.

Independent claims 1, 4 and 7 are amended to clarify features recited thereby.

Formal Matters

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for foreign priority and the receipt of the priority document.

Further, Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging review and consideration of the references cited in the Information Disclosure Statements filed on August 8, 2003 and on October 23, 2003, respectively.

Rejection of Claims 1, 4 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1, 4 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Blanchard, U.S. Patent No. 6,408,191. This rejection is traversed.

Among the problems recognized and solved by Applicant's claimed invention is that in the conventional art a user of a portable telephone set or other similar handheld device does not know how many times a telephone number or person listed in the directory of the portable device was called by or called to the portable device.¹ According to an aspect of Applicant's claimed

¹ The present discussion illustrates aspects of Applicant's claimed invention. Applicant does not represent that every embodiment of Applicant's claimed invention necessarily embodies or provides the solutions herein discussed or addresses the problems herein identified.

invention, the total number of cases of the retrieving data is displayed to the user as shown for example in Figures 4 and 5.

For at least the following reasons, Applicant's claimed invention is neither anticipated by nor rendered obvious from the cited prior art, including Blanchard and Cushman. By way of example, independent claims 1, 4 and 7 require that the data retrieved are displayed together with the total number of cases of the retrieved data, the total number of cases being a number of times that a number represented by an item of the retrieved data at least one of called the portable telephone set and was called by the portable telephone set.

Blanchard discloses displaying messages on a telephone terminal to provide easy access to messages received (Blanchard, Abstract). Blanchard discloses providing message menu choices in the message display to provide quick access to messages and other features of the telephone terminal (Blanchard, col. 1, lines 47- col. 2, line 40).

Blanchard does not disclose or suggests providing an indication to the user of a number of times that a telephone number was called and/or a number of times that the telephone number called the portable device. Blanchard does not disclose or suggest keeping track of such information, nor displaying data retrieved together with the total number of cases of the retrieved data, as required, *inter alia*, by independent claims 1, 4 and 7.

Further, since Blanchard does not disclose or suggest displaying the total number of cases of the retrieved data, Blanchard is incapable of disclosing display of the total number of cases, the total number of cases of being

a number of times that a number represented by an item of the retrieved data at least one of called the portable telephone set and was called by the portable telephone set, as further *inter alia* required by independent claims 1, 4 and 7.

Therefore, Blanchard does not disclose or suggest the recitations of independent claims 1, 4 and 7. Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 2, 5 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 2, 5 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious from Blanchard and Cushman, U.S. Patent No. 6,125,287. This rejection is traversed.

Claims 2, 5 and 8 depend from independent claims 1, 4 and 7, respectively, and thus claims 2, 5 and 8 incorporate novel and nonobvious features of their respective base claims.

Cushman does not remedy the deficiencies of Blanchard as they relate to Applicant's invention as claimed in independent claims 1, 4 and 7. Cushman discloses a First Directory (memory locations 1-8) for frequently called numbers and a Second Directory (Main Directory) (Cushman, col. 3, line 55 through col. 4, lined 18), such that in both the First Directory and the Second Directory entries are arranged in alphabetical order (Cushman, col. 5, line 48-59).

Cushman does not disclose or suggest that the data retrieved are displayed together with the total number of cases of the retrieved data, as *inter alia*, required by independent claims 1, 4 and 7. Therefore, Blanchard and Cushman, even taken together as a whole, do not disclose or suggest the

recitations of independent claims 1, 4 and 7. Accordingly, claims 2, 5 and 8 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art for at least the reasons that independent claims 1, 4 and 7 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art. Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn.

For at least the reasons set forth in the foregoing discussion, Applicant believes that the Application is now allowable, and respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejections and allow the Application. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this Amendment, or regarding the Application generally, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



George Brieger
Registration No. 52,652

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser
400 Garden City Plaza
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343, Ext. 503

GB:eg